

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA
REGULAR MEETING
MAY 20, 2003
DRAFT

The Board of County Commissioners of Leon County, Florida met in regular session with Chairman Grippa presiding. Present were Commissioners Sauls, Thael, Winchester, Proctor, Rackleff and Maloy. Also present were County Attorney Herb Thiele, County Administrator Parwez Alam, and Deputy Clerk Secretary Sandra C. O'Neal. The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

Invocation was provided by Commissioner Bill Proctor Maloy followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Awards and Presentations

- Commissioners Thael and Winchester, on behalf of the Board, presented the attached Resolution to Harry Martinez on his retirement after serving as Chorus Director at Florida High for 41 years. Former students Carol Kio-Green, Bert Hartsfield, Martin Green, and Commissioner Winchester commended their former chorus teacher and shared stories.

Consent

Commissioner Sauls moved, duly seconded by Commissioner Maloy and carried unanimously, 6-0 (Commissioner Proctor was not present) to approve the following Consent Agenda with the exception of Item 3 which was addressed as described:

1. Approval of Payment of Bills and Vouchers Submitted for May 20, 2003

The Board approved Option 1: Approve payment of bills and vouchers submitted for approval for May 20, 2003: \$1,685,261.46

2. Acceptance of Conservation Easement for the St. Joe Tram Road Limited Partition

This item requests approval and acceptance of a conservation easement for the St. Joe Tram Road Limited Partition, consistent with the requirements and conditions of the Site and Development Plan approval. The Board approved Option 1: Approve and accept for recording the conservation easement for the St. Joe Limited Partition Subdivision. (The conservation easement is by St. Joe Timberland Company of Delaware, L.L.C., a Delaware limited liability company whose address is 1400 Oven Park Drive, Tallahassee, Florida.

3. Authorization for Renewal of Agreement with Bellwether Solutions LLC for Experimental Test Program

Chairman Grippa pulled this item and asked if there was a performance report on the activity. Paul Cozzie, Director of Parks and Recreation, explained that a report is submitted with each renewal and is waiting on the current year report.

He explained that there has been phenomenal success by using the sheep to eliminate the kudzu and the herd consists of approximately 2,000 sheep. Mr. Cozzie advised that some sheep would be moved to Lake Jackson area. Commissioner Sauls moved, duly seconded by Commissioner Rackleff and carried unanimously, 7/0 to approve Option 1: Approve the renewal of the agreement with Bellwether Solutions LLC for the fourth year funding in the amount of \$25,000 to continue experimental program using sheep to control kudzu and other invasive plant species along the Miccosukee Canopy Road Greenery, J. R. Alford Greenway, and other public areas as assigned, and authorize the Chairman to execute the agreement.

4. Acceptance Assessment Roll for The Glen at Golden Eagle, Phase I, 2/3 – 2/3 Project and Schedule Public Hearings Regarding the Special Improvement Liens and for Adoption of a Non-ad Valorem Assessment Roll

The Board approved Options 1, 2, and 3: 1) Accept the assessment roll for The Glen at Golden Eagle, Phase I, 2/3 – 2/3 Project; 2) Authorize staff to schedule a public hearing to impose the liens for The Glen at Golden Eagle, Phase I, 2/3 – 2/3 Project on June 24, 2003 at 6:00 p.m., 3) Authorize staff to schedule a public hearing to adopt a non-ad valorem assessment roll for The Glen at Golden Eagle, Phase I, 2/3 – 2/3 Project on June 24, 2003 at 6:00 p.m.

5. Accept Assessment Roll for Frontier Estates 2/3 – 2/3 Project and Schedule Public Hearings Regarding the Proposed Special Assessment Liens and for Adoption of a Non-ad Valorem Assessment Roll

The Board approved Options 1, 2, and 3: 1) Accept the assessment roll for the Frontier Estates 2/3 – 2/3 Project; 2) Authorize staff to schedule a public hearing to impose the liens for the Frontier Estates 2/3 – 2/3 Project on June 24, 2003 at 6:00 p.m., 3) Authorize staff to schedule a public hearing to adopt a non-ad valorem assessment roll for the Frontier Estates 2/3 – 2/3 Project on June 24, 2003 at 6:00 p.m.

General Business

6. Request for Reimbursement of Attorney's Fees Pursuant to Policy 03-02, by Commissioner Rudolph Maloy

This is a request for reimbursement of attorney's fees and costs by Commissioner Rudolph Maloy pursuant to the Board of County Commissioners Policy No. 03-02 (Reimbursement of Attorneys Fees and Costs). The agenda request lists the sequence of events. On January 3, 2003, the County Attorney's Office received correspondence from Stephen S. Dobson, III, Attorney at Law, requesting on behalf of Commissioner Rudolph Maloy, reimbursement of legal fees and costs. Such costs were incurred by Mr. Dobson as a result of defending Mr. Maloy in *State of Florida v. Rudolph Maloy*, Case No. R2001-2042, *State of Florida v. Rudolph Maloy*, Case No. 2002-9373, and *State of Florida v. Rudolph Maloy*, First District Court of Appeal Case No. 1D02-1200. That correspondence included a letter dated December 20, 2002, from Commissioner Maloy to the County Attorney, requesting reimbursement of attorney's fees and costs which is included in the agenda. Also included was a copy of Invoice No. 10016 detailing

the time expenditures and costs, totaling \$338,836.92. On January 8, 2003, the County Attorney made a request to Stephen S. Dobson, III, Attorney at Law, for additional relevant information deemed necessary to assist the County Attorney in reviewing the request in accordance with Board policy. On January 13, 2003, the County Attorney's Office received a response from Attorney Dobson, which complied with the County Attorney's request for copies of the information filed in Case No. R2001-2042 and Case No. R2002-9373.

On January 28, 2003, the Board reviewed Commissioner Maloy's request for reimbursement of attorney's fees and costs and voted to find and declare that the request for reimbursement of attorney's fees and costs submitted by Commissioner Maloy were not in compliance with County Policy No. 03-02.

County Attorney Thiele explained that the issue before the Board tonight is whether or not the Board is going to grant the request for the reimbursement of attorney's fees, which are approximately \$339,000, which is inclusive of about \$4,000 in costs. He stated that Policy Number 03-02 permits the reimbursement under certain circumstances for both civil and criminal actions and the two items that the Board should consider are entitlement and reasonableness of the fees requested. He explained that the Board must make two determinations; that the fee request is part of an activity that was done in the course and scope of Commissioner Maloy's job duties and whether or not the activity served a public purpose. The agenda material contains information regarding attorney's fees for rates and hours charged in the area. The Board would have to determine not only the reasonableness of the hourly rates and the number or hours billed but also whether or not all of the rates and hours in Commissioner Maloy's bill are attributable to the County's reimbursement program. Attorney Thiele opined that this is a matter that falls squarely within the County's reimbursement policy and is eligible for the Board's consideration, whether or not the Board agrees that it meets the two-pronged test.

The following speakers appeared:

Rick Bateman, 300 E. Park Avenue, appeared and stated that he is not representing Commissioner Maloy, but wanted to make some comments. He explained that Commissioner Maloy has survived a civil suit, which was settled by the County over his protest; he survived a referral by FDLE and a criminal trial by an overzealous State Attorney, and he survived an ethics hearing. He further commented that in every situation where Commissioner Maloy has presented all the facts of his case, he has been found acquitted and has been found to have not violated any standards of conduct. Mr. Bateman stated that the County Attorney is in an untenable position and suggested that the Board use an arbitrator or an outside legal firm and report back to the Board within 30 days. He suggested that whatever amount that the Board decides to pay Commissioner Maloy, that they take the same out of the State Attorney's budget for next year.

Carol Kio-Green, 4823 Sullivan Road, referred to the agenda item which explains that the Board voted on January 28, 2003 to find that the fees and costs submitted by Commissioner Maloy to not be in compliance with Policy 03-02. She alleged that it is still not in compliance and is not responsive to the issues

that are most pertinent. She pointed out that Commissioner Maloy should respond to the request made by County Attorney Thiele on January 7, 2003 and as required in the policy: "describe with specificity how the individual criminal counts in each of the felony and misdemeanor prosecutions arise out of or are in connection within Commissioner Maloy's scope of County employment or as County function while serving a public purpose." Ms. Kio-Green stated that the answer has still not been provided and it is the obligation of the applicant to provide the answers. She asked the Board to confirm that anything relative to FDOT charges not to be paid by the citizens of Leon County.

The Board engaged in a lengthy dialogue with the County Attorney regarding the matter.

Commissioner Rackleff stated that the issue before the Board tonight is: Did Commissioner Maloy comply with the Board's request in January to submit a bill that accurately reflects the costs of his legal defense in the aspects of the criminal case that covered his conduct as a County Commissioner? Commissioner Rackleff pointed out that rather than getting a response to the request, the Board received the same bill that they received in January 2003. He opined that the bill does not specify the billable hours that were spent on accounts that directly relate to his County Commission responsibilities and is not an accurate bill that the County should pay. He remarked that the Board can address the question of whether the bill is payable once they know what the accurate charges are and the levels of payment should be. Commissioner Rackleff indicated that this could be discussed later, but tonight the Board does not have an accurate bill.

Commissioner Rackleff moved and was duly seconded by Commissioner Thaeil to approve Option 4: Deny the request for reimbursement of attorney's fees and costs from Commissioner Maloy.

Since Commissioners would be making inquiries of the County Attorney about the issue, Chairman Grippa asked County Attorney Thiele if he had any conflicts. Attorney Thiele responded that he is able to advise the Board on what the law is, although he may not necessarily be able to tell them about the allocation of the fees, but he could give examples of reasonable fees. He stated that if this item goes beyond the Commission stage such as arbitration or some sort of litigation, he would not be able to represent the County but at this point, he had no problem with responding to questions by Commissioners.

Commissioner Thaeil asked if the County Attorney represents all individual Commissioners as well as the Board of County Commissioners and he responded in the affirmative. Commissioner Thaeil stated that since the County Attorney represents Commissioner Maloy as an individual Commissioner, it puts the County Attorney, to some degree, in a conflicting position because there is an innocent and adversarial relationship between the collective Commission and one Commissioner in this instance. Attorney Thiele responded that this is theoretically possible.

Commissioner Thaeil asked Attorney Thiele if it was his opinion that this response is in compliance with the County's policy for reimbursement. Attorney

Thiele responded that it was, to a certain extent, and pointed out that it is his opinion that costs of defense, be it cost or attorney's fees for matters, which do not relate to one's function as a County official do not qualify under the County's policy for reimbursement. Attorney Thiele explained that he has spoken to Attorney Dobson on certain occasions and Mr. Dobson was of the belief that the charges and work that was done on the account are so intertwined and interconnected that it is impossible to provide a breakdown, i.e. that all of the matters, all of the witnesses, all of depositions, appeals and trials were so interrelated and inseparable that it is not possible for him to provide such a breakdown, and thus, there is no ability to allocate the fees on a percentage basis or however one stacks FACT's (Florida Association of Counties Trust) involvement in the issue. Attorney Thiele opined that there was some entitlement due in some fashion and that it meets the *Thornber v. City of Fort Walton Beach* test in part, but not in its total application. Mr. Thiele explained that he has made some calculations but he has not seen a breakdown because Mr. Dobson felt that it was not capable to do so. Attorney Thiele stated that he believes that Commissioner Maloy and Mr. Dobson's response to the "public purpose" is that the entire bill meets the criteria of the policy, although he does not agree with that.

The Board engaged in discussion regarding case law and various attorney's fees and costs for criminal cases and noted that it varies from \$110 per hour to an excess of \$300 per hour as explained in the agenda material. Attorney Thiele reminded the Board that they previously were concerned about an official or employee being able to choose whatever attorney they wanted and charge whatever billable hours they wanted; he is currently working on that issue and attempting to come up with some common standard fee. Mr. Thiele cited a criminal case that Mr. Dobson represented a couple of years ago in Alachua County where the fees and costs totaled \$1.5 million. In that case, Mr. Dobson agreed to take a \$200 per hour fee for all of the time billed on the filing inclusive of associates and paralegal across the board; that was a negotiated number that Mr. Dobson was willing to accept.

Attorney Thiele explained that his understanding of the charges in Commissioner Maloy's case involve travel on behalf of various entities and employers to attend conferences and seminars. Based on that, as the County pays for Commissioners and employees to attend seminars and the like, he believes that this is an item that falls in the course and scope of the Board's powers and duties, within the scope of what Commissioners' job functions are; the destinations and activities involved would serve a public purpose by educating a Commissioner including participation of Commission related activities. Mr. Thiele stated that two of the issues before the Board is: 1) whether or not the travel on behalf of the County meets the *Thornber v. City of Fort Walton Beach* test and 2) does travel on behalf of FAC (Florida Association of Counties) or Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) meet the test. Attorney Thiele advised that this bill does not differentiate among any of those various aspects; it does not differentiate during the felony and appeal portion of the case; it does not differentiate during the misdemeanor portion of the case in which one of the four counts was an accusation against Commissioner Maloy about Leon County travel reimbursement request. Attorney Thiele stated that based upon this bill he is unable to distinguish what part of the bill meets the test and opined that the

request for some differentiation in not an unreasonable request, that some breakdown is necessary or some arbitrary agreed upon figure would need to be utilized and say that it represents a fair split on the cost.

Commissioner Winchester moved, duly seconded by Commissioner Thael and carried unanimously, 7/0, to continue the 6:00 p.m. public hearings for 20 minutes, until the conclusion of this discussion.

The Board resumed discussion of the request for reimbursement of attorney's fees and costs by Commissioner Maloy.

Commissioner Sauls asked if the two-pronged test had been met. Attorney Thiele stated that the question is: Has the *Thornber v. Fort Walton Beach* test and the reasonableness of the fee been met as it relates to a request for \$339,000 and his response is that it has not been met. Attorney Thiele stated that the County is obligated by law to pay a portion of the fee if the two-part test is met.

Chairman Grippa stated that it needs to be determined if the \$383,000 bill was reasonable and customarily, and it is the burden of Commissioner Maloy to come forward and do the following: 1) explain why he has not reimbursed the County for \$30,000 that was paid as deductibles (FACT); 2) Commissioner Maloy should articulate in the bill what trips he has taken without the companion of an aide that involved County business and served a public purpose); 3) what is FDOT's portion of the bill and what portion is the County's. Chairman Grippa stated that he would be willing to review and consider whether the County owes something for the trips where an Aide did not accompany Commissioner Maloy.

Commissioner Rackleff inquired if Commissioner Maloy had applied to FDOT for reimbursement of costs and fees. Mr. Thiele stated that to his knowledge, he had not.

Commissioner Maloy stated, for the record, that Mr. Dodson's letter states that the bill did not include anything for FDOT.

Commissioner Maloy advised that he has talked to the County Attorney about voting on this issue and he would abstain/recuse himself from the vote.

Commissioner Sauls asked if the motion includes that the bill be resubmitted, itemized and respond on the *Thornber v. Fort Walton Beach* two-part test. The County Attorney responded that the motion on the floor does not include that.

Commissioner Rackleff stated that it is clear what the Board is asking for and that is an accurate bill and that is why the Board is rejecting the bill.

The motion carried on the floor, Option 4 – Deny the request for reimbursement of attorney's fees and costs from Commissioner Maloy, carried 5 – 1 (Commissioner Proctor voted in opposition and Commissioner Maloy obtained from voting, see conflict of interest form).

The Board entered discussion of Public Hearing Item 10.

7. Consideration of Proposed Ordinance for Approval of Special Exception Land Development Proposals by the Board of County Commissioners

This is a consideration of an ordinance to subject all special exception land development proposals, as defined under the current land development code, to review and approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

Carol Kio-Green, 4823 Sullivan Road, appeared and stated that she would like to alleviate fears of the length of the quasi-judicial hearings, that she reviewed the minutes and noted that the last one that was heard only lasted over three hours. She made other comments and recommended some changes including the inclusion of Division 8, which involves the uses of bed and breakfast, adult day care, mobile homes and mobile home parks. County Attorney Thiele responded that Division 8 was already listed in the Code and the criteria are required by staff. Commissioner Rackleff pointed out that everything on the list is permissible with few exemptions.

Commissioner Thael moved, duly seconded by Commissioner Maloy and carried unanimously, 7/0, to approve Options 1 and 2: Direct staff to schedule the proposed ordinance for consistency review by the Planning Commission and schedule the first public hearing; 2) Direct staff to draft additional ordinance(s) to implement the Board's decision to appoint a hearing officer to conduct quasi-judicial proceedings on land development proposals for special exception uses and issue recommendations to the Board.

8. Consideration of Potential Alternatives to the Current Board Meeting Schedule

Pursuant to Board direction, this item presents potential alternatives to the Board's current meeting schedule for Board review and consideration.

George E. Lewis, II, 203 North Gadsden Street #6, appeared and urged the Board to leave the meeting schedule as it is, meeting every Tuesday except the first Tuesday of the month, and indicated the importance of being available for citizens. He voiced objection to the money spent on meals for Commissioners on meeting nights. Mr. Lewis also indicated that by holding only two meetings per month, the meetings would be longer, therefore resulting in more mistakes by the Board.

The Board engaged in discussion about the number of meetings that other counties of this size hold.

Commissioner Proctor moved and was duly seconded by Commissioner Thael to approve Option 1: Direct staff to reduce the Board meeting schedule to two regularly scheduled Board meetings a month on the 2nd and 4th Tuesday of each month and to develop and bring back an implementation schedule for Board review and approval.

More discussion ensued and Commissioner Winchester indicated that according to the agenda analysis, this would save \$50,000 per year and he hoped these savings could be used for "late night media" at the schools. The Board indicated

that the schedule change would allow for a more sensible workload for staff, help staff morale, allow for a better quality of work, and allow staff to devote time to other important projects. They also indicated the importance of accommodating and being accessible to citizens and suggested, if necessary, meetings could be held in the interim. It was noted that workshops would be held on the same Tuesday's as the Board meetings.

The motion on the floor carried 6 – 1 (Commissioner Thaeli voted in opposition).

9. Request for Property Proposals (RFPP) for Relocation Sites for Growth and Environmental Management (GEM)

This item seeks the Board's approval to issue RFPP for the County's Growth and Environmental Management (GEM) offices.

Commissioner Thaeli moved, seconded by Commissioner Maloy to approve Options 1: Approve the issuance of a Request for Property Proposal (RFPP) for relocation sites for GEM.

Rick Bateman, representing Jefferson Management, lobbyist, voiced concern about cutting a deal before they know the price of the building and indicated that some FDOT issues need to be resolved such as eminent domain and some parking places are being taken.

Following some discussion, Commissioner Thaeli withdrew his motion and moved to continue the item to June 10, 2003. Commissioner Rackleff seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7/0. Chairman indicated that some changes should be incorporated and that anyone can contact commissioners on the issue. Kim Dressel, Management Services Director, indicated that the FDOT issues would be clarified and revisions would be made to the RFP.

Public Hearings

10. Public Hearing on Abandonment of an Un-named Sixty-foot Right-of-Way located on the East Side of Arendell Way, Approximately 1,900 Feet South of Miccosukee Road

Pursuant to the following legal advertisement, a public hearing was conducted on the abandonment.

Megan Altavilla, 2623 Arendell Way, requested that the Board approve the abandonment but to delete the following recommendation "that includes, but is not limited to, utilities, stormwater and pedestrian access." She stated that it is not a place for walking and was concerned about transients coming in the area.

Mary Cantey, 2356 Arendell Way, requested that pedestrian access be eliminated and stated that nearby Thornton Road was not compatible with Arendell Road and felt there would be problems with people coming through yards into the her neighborhood.

Following some discussion, Commissioner Thael moved to approve Option 1, but delete the pedestrian access as suggested by Ms. Altavilla: Option 1 – Conduct the public hearing and adopt the abandonment resolution, abandoning the subject unnamed sixty-foot right-of-way provided that the subject area is placed in a public easement that includes, but is not limited to, utilities, stormwater (delete “and pedestrian access.” The motion was declared dead for lack of a second.

Commissioner Rackleff moved approval of Option 1, which was to approve the abandonment as recommended. The motion was declared dead for lack of a second.

Following some discussion, Commissioner Maloy moved, duly seconded by Commissioner Proctor and carried unanimously, 5/0 (Commissioners Winchester and Grippa were out of the Chambers. After returning to the Chambers, Chairman Grippa requested that his vote reflect the affirmative), to approve Option 1: Conduct the public hearing and adopt the attached Abandonment Resolution R03-, abandoning the subject unnamed sixty-foot right-of-way provided that the subject area be placed in a public easement that includes, but is not limited to, utilities, stormwater and pedestrian access. Commissioner Thael asked that law enforcement pay special attention to this area and if there appear to be problems with vagrants, the pedestrian access could be reviewed.

11. Public Hearing on Abandonment of Sixty-Foot Undeveloped Right-of-Way Located on the South Side of Whitehouse Road, Approximately 900 Feet South of Capitola Road

Commissioner Maloy moved, duly seconded by Commissioner Proctor to approve Option 1 to approve Option 1: Conduct the public hearing and adopt the Abandonment Resolution and abandon the subject sixty-foot undeveloped right-of-way, located on the south side of Whitehouse Road, approximately 900 feet south of Capitola Road.

The Board engaged in some discussion and Mr. Tedder, Planning Department, responded to the Board's inquiries. There was some discussion about the rural area in a community and the potential to be expanded to south and the Board indicate that they wanted additional information.

Commissioner Rackleff moved a substitute motion, seconded by Commissioner Thael and carried unanimously, 5/0 (Commissioners Grippa and Winchester were out of the Chambers; later in the meeting, Chairman Grippa requested that his vote reflect the affirmative), to continue this public hearing to June 10, 2003 at 6:00 p.m.

The Board then entered discussion on Item 7.

County Attorney

Discussed the Bank of America (BOA) bond closing which is scheduled for May 27th according to the ordinance (\$21 million - A.G. Edwards Underwriters). County Attorney Thiele informed the Board that Terri Ryan has contacted the

State Attorney's Office regarding presenting information to a Grand Jury but advised that the closing date would be on schedule.

Discussion Items by Commissioners

Chairman Grippa

- a. Advised that he received a request by City Commissioner Mark Mustian to set up a committee to establish Springhill Road as a "Gateway to the City."
- b. Appointed Commissioner Rackleff to represent the Intergovernmental Agency (Blueprint 2000) and Commissioner Proctor to represent the Springhill Road.

Commissioner Rackleff

Appointed Rob Mayewski to the Dorothy C. Spence Community Center Board of Directors to replace Charlene Daniels, who resigned.

Commissioner Proctor

- a. Distributed documents to the Board: A memorandum to the Board requesting the Board's support for a Comp Plan Amendment prohibiting bank redlining and to consider an ordinance to mirror the CRA (City's re-investment policy passed by Congress); a memorandum to the Board requesting a workshop on the County's pending RFP for banking service – Community Reinvestment Act; Ghetto-Riffic Lending patterns of local banks; Commissioner Proctor's letter to Chairman Grippa and City Mayor Marks regarding Wachovia Bank.

Commissioner Proctor noted that only 2.3% of new home loans were invested in Census Tract with majority black population from 1995 – 2000 and he was concerned that the percentage of loans to African-American in the southern strategy area was very low. He pointed out that while Wachovia Bank is the bank that the County and City uses as its depository bank, the bank in turn has not provided many loans to the black population in the southern strategy. He asked that the Board conduct a workshop on the County's pending RFP for banking services and to look at the lending patterns of certain banks and what they put back into the community. The Board indicated that they should focus on other banks, mortgage lending firms, credit unions and other financial institutions and not single out Wachovia Bank when researching their lending patterns. They also noted that the Clerk of the Circuit Court has control of the County's banking choice. Commissioner Proctor also noted that the "Parade of Homes" listed homes in certain areas but did not include homes in the southern area.

Chairman Grippa advised that he would present this issue at the upcoming Mayor/Chairman meeting and would bring back a recommendation regarding a workshop. He suggested that the City also conduct a workshop on this issue

- b. Requested a retirement resolution for Bill Johnson, Assistant Superintendent of Schools.
- c. Advised that Bond Clinic has security issues and women working late at night in the pharmacy need security measures. An agenda item would be brought back.

Commissioner Thaeil

- a. Requested that the County Administrator assist in mediating issues regarding the Bond Clinic renewal of its lease with Leon County Health Department and to consider the possible expansion of services. There is an opportunity to expand to include the WIC program.
- b. Discussed and requested reconsideration of Item 10 on Intergovernmental Agency meeting agenda, Item 10.
- c. Gave a letter to County Administrator from Bonnie Fay Groves regarding grading of Joe Thomas Road.

Chairman Grippa

- a. Referred to letter from Rick Eggers, Chairman of the Tallahassee Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, supporting the elimination of the differential fee charged to non-city residents.
- b. Requested to place on the next agenda, May 27, 2003, the Fourth of July Celebration, Celebrate America item.

The Board wished all a Happy Holiday.

There being no further items to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

APPROVED: _____
Tony Grippa
Chairman

ATTEST:

Bob Inzer
Clerk of the Circuit Court